

REMARKS

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated August 16, 2005, where the Examiner finally rejected claims 19-32. Applicant has cancelled claims 19-32 and submits new claims 33 - 48. Accordingly, claims 33- 48 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully responds to Examiner's Detailed Action and requests the Examiner place all the claims in the application in a state of allowance in view of the following remarks.

A. Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 19 and 26, and dependent claims 20-23, 28 and 29 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sutton et al., U.S. Patent 6,600,931 (hereinafter referred to "Sutton '931"). Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, to expedite the prosecution of this patent application, applicant has cancelled the previous claims and provided new claims 33-48.

The new independent system claim 33 is distinguishable from Sutton '931 because Sutton fails to teach *inter alia* an auxiliary reception system comprising a first processing module, a second processing module, and a selector module. Additionally, Sutton '931 fails to teach a controller that is operatively connected to the main antenna system and the selector module. Additional limitations that relate to controller and selector module further distinguish the new independent claim 33 from Sutton '931.

The new independent method claim 43 is distinguishable from the Sutton '931 patent because the method claim is directed to providing enhanced reception in a diversity antenna system that comprises *inter alia* receiving second communication signals via the auxiliary antenna and the first signal processing model, selectably connecting the auxiliary antenna to a second signal processing module, receiving an auxiliary signal via the auxiliary antenna and the second signal processing module; passing one of the second communications signals and the auxiliary signal; and separately receiving the first communication signals and the passed one of the of the second communication signals and the auxiliary signals. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 34-42 and 44-48, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons stated above with regard to independent claims 33 and 43, respectively.

B. Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 103

Regarding claims 24, 25, 30 and 31, the Examiner rejected these claims as being unpatentable over Sutton '931, in view of Burdick '820. In view of the new independent claims 33 and 43 described above, applicant contends that the 103 rejection is moot because new independent claims 33 and 43 are patently distinguishable over Sutton '931 and Burdick '820, considered singly or in combination.

With respect to new independent claim 33, Burdick '820 and Sutton '931 fail to teach *inter alia* an auxiliary reception system comprising a first processing module, a second processing module, and a selector module. Additionally, Sutton '931 fails to teach a controller that is operatively connected to the main

antenna system and the selector module. Additional limitations that relate to controller and selector module further distinguish the new independent claim 33 from Sutton '931.


With respect to new independent method claim 43, Burdick '820 and Sutton '931 fail to teach a method for providing enhanced reception in a diversity antenna system that comprises *inter alia* receiving second communication signals via the auxiliary antenna and the first signal processing model, selectably connecting the auxiliary antenna to a second signal processing module, receiving an auxiliary signal via the auxiliary antenna and the second signal processing module; passing one of the second communications signals and the auxiliary signal; and separately receiving the first communication signals and the passed one of the of the second communication signals and the auxiliary signals. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 34-42 and 44-48, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons stated above with regard to independent claims 33 and 43, respectively.

C. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, allowance of pending claims 33 - 48 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted;

Dated: Oct 18, 2005


Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.
Reg. No. 42,200

Jonathan T. Velasco, Esq.
Kyocera Wireless Corp.
Attn: Patent Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Tel: (858) 882-3501
Fax: (858) 882-2485